

Date: Fri, 18 Mar 94 04:30:06 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #302
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 18 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 302

Today's Topics:

 25_years_of_portable_phone
 Best cars for mobile HF/VHF??

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 17 Mar 94 19:33:16 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: 25_years_of_portable_phone
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

=====
HISTORICAL NOTE: 25th ANNIVERSARY OF THE CORDLESS PHONE
=====

Background:

The purpose of this message is to contribute to the collective
justifiable pride that radio amateurs maintain for their contri-
butions to the advancements of the radio arts.

Radio amateurs should be aware that the cordless telephone, used
in millions of households today, was pioneered by an amateur.

Inventor:

George Sweigert, now 74, licensed as N9LC since 1975 and formerly

W8ZIS, was granted a patent in June, 1969 for a wireless portable telephone device. The specific patent claim was for "full duplex radio communications".

The original instrument was dubbed "extensi-phone", and consisted of a 'base station', acoustically coupled to the telephone network, and a small hand-held 'extension'. The caller could receive incoming telephone calls, as the telephone company's ringer voltage activated the telephone instrument's ringer, an inductively coupled circuit (prior to the FCC's Carterphone Decision it was illegal to directly connect to the telephone line) activated the base station's transmitter, signalling the portable extension device. The telephone call then took place.

After an FCC type acceptance review, the commissioner at that time commented, "this is the most significant advancement in communications since the invention of the television...".

Today, N9LC is active on CW traffic nets and exotict CW DX-ing. He resides in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and is a member of the Fort Wayne Amateur Radio Club.

An application is pending before the Inventors Hall of Fame, Akron, Ohio, to induct this instrument into the Hall of Fame.

The author:

David Sweigert, KE9YP, is the third born son of Mr. Sweigert.

=====

Date: Thu, 17 Mar 94 10:59:57 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!lyra.csx.cam.ac.uk!pavo.csi.cam.ac.uk!
pipex!uknet!uos-ee!ee.surrey.ac.uk!M.Willis@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Best cars for mobile HF/VHF??
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CMIACE.D9C@hpmoca.sqf.hp.com>, dstock@hpmoca.sqf.hp.com (David Stockton) writes:

|>
|> I'm happy with my choice, a Diesel powered Range-Rover derivative
|> called a "Discovery"
|>
|> Give serious thought to Diesels, no ignition, no computers
|>

|>

|> David GM4ZNX

Yes, but at a mere 18,000 pounds not many can afford such a car. Practically, I found the Cavallier reasonable RF quiet. Fiat Uno, too noisy. Diesels are definately better, they have a bigger battery too.

Mike

Date: 17 Mar 1994 11:54:39 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.utdallas.edu!corpgate!
bnrgate!bnr.co.uk!uknet!EU.net!sun4nl!news.nic.surfnet.nl!tuegate.tue.nl!
blade.stack.urc.tue.nl!robs@network.UCSD

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2m7pt4\$dc9@news.iastate.edu>, <763851432snz@g8s.jp.demon.co.uk>,
<2m7v0h\$gld@news.iastate.edu>

Subject : Re: 1x1 Callsigns?

In article <2m7v0h\$gld@news.iastate.edu>,

William J Turner <wjturner@iastate.edu> wrote:

>In article <763851432snz@g8s.jp.demon.co.uk> ip@g8s.jp.demon.co.uk writes:

>>Actually, I *have* checked the international agreements. Sadly, I can find no
>>distinction between 'amateur service' and any other callsigns. It is, of
>>course, possible that I'm looking in the wrong place.

>

Try the ITU Radio Regulations

>I know I read somewhere (sorry, don't know exactly where :-() that amateur
>calls are to follow the pattern I gave earlier (prefix--number--suffix). As I
>understand, this is for ham calls only, although the country designations used
>in the prefixes are used for all radio stations--amateur, commercial,
>government, military, etc.

>

>>As I've said, I have been unable to find anything that differentiates amateur
>>callsigns allocations (at an international level) from other classes.

>>

>>If you accept the premise that *all* callsigns are issued according to
>>international agreement, then either they will have to contain (somewhere) a
>>numeric character, or they will not. Fine. A strange coincidence: callsigns
>>assigned to aircraft (and shipping, for that matter ...) rarely - although
>>the FAA seem to be the very exeception that proves the rule - contain numeric
>>characters.

>

As far as I remember from may days at the Nautical College Rotterdam (Radio
officer training) there really is an imposed standard.

Somewhere I must still have my "Handbook for use in the maritime mobile and

maritime mobile satellite service" being a subset of the Radio Regulations from the ITU. There might be more info. From my memory:

Shipping: Fixed stations (coast stations): XXX(##) meaning three alpha's as main callsign, to be used on the general calling frequency's whereas a numerical suffix (to the call) is allowed to identify different frequencies in different bands.

Mobile stations (ships): XXXX or XX####(##). De XX####(##) version is often used for yachts, and non-seagoing vessels. The XXXX is used (by tradition) by large seaships (cargo vessels, passenger liners etc.)

NB: There is no such thing as prefix here. Just callsign and suffix.

>As I said before, I only heard about this system for amateur calls. There may
>possibly be some system for other calls, also, but I have not read of it
>anywhere that I know of...

>

>>British aircraft registrations and callsigns look like 'GBOAC'. I expect more
>>than a few D.C. area residents have seen that

>>

According to same source as above Aircraft use XXXXX as callsign. No prefix, no suffix. Sometimes there also variations like X(X)#####(##) probably just like shipping because of limited number of possible XXXXX calls.

>>Oh - and where's the necessity to have a *number* to separate a prefix from
>>a suffix??? When you operate in another country, don't you (generally) take
>>the prefix (ITU assigned) and separate it from the suffix (your entire call)
>>by a '/' ?

Wasn't that the otherway around these days? <foreign prefix>/<your call>?

>

>I'm sorry to sound as if there must be a number between them; I meant there
>must be *something*. A prefix and suffix must have something to be the prefix
>and suffix of, and in this system it is always a number. This makes it easy
>to tell the prefix and suffix, even in the prefix has a number in it. The
>separator (or the mandatory number as I called it earlier--however misleading
>it was) is always the *last* number. (Thus our recurring A6#XX has # as the
>separaotr.)

According again to above source, I recall the imposed call-sign scheme for amateur radio is : XX#XX(X). Because many callsigns go back way before these regulations, old callsign are allowed, provided the prefix is according to the current prefix allocation.

Country's are free to attach a meaning to the '#' (geographic location or licence type or clubstation or repeater or whatever) and basically two-letter suffixes should not be assigned anymore. They should die out of old age, leaving only three-letter suffixes (but then - we're all going that way).

I still have some ITU docs lying around somewhere or stashed in a box on the attic from my sea-going period (stopped in '82). If someone doubt my response (or rather a lot of someones) I might try to dig 'em up.

73,

Rob Soulier, PA3AXI

Date: 17 Mar 1994 12:36:19 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!lerc.nasa.gov!news.larc.nasa.gov!
eos1.larc.nasa.gov!eckman@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <763851432snz@g8sjp.demon.co.uk>, <2m7v0h\$g1d@news.iastate.edu>,
<2m9gdv\$6un@tuegate.tue.nl>

Subject : Re: 1x1 Callsigns?

With regard to the apparent international regulations requiring a specific format to an amateur callsign, could someone actually dig up article 32 of the ITU regulations (which deal with amateur radio communications) and let us know what it really says?

Drawing analogies with AM radio station callsigns, coast guard, and airplane designators strikes me as entirely beside the point.

The fact that the Marshall Islands are not using a number following their V7 prefix is not proof that a number isn't necessary. They may just be ignoring or ignorant of ITU regs.

Could someone please quote the relevant ITU regs for us? Maybe someone at ARRL HQ with easy access to the text.

Richard Eckman K04MR
NASA Langley
eckman@eos1.larc.nasa.gov

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #302

